

REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendment and reconsideration in view of the amendment and the following remarks.

The amendment to the description corrects obvious errors in the description of the drawings to conform to the drawings.

The amendments to the claims correct grammatical errors and obvious that the applicant was not previously aware of and those skilled in the art in view of the specification would have understood the claims without the above amendments. The amendments were not statutorily necessary for the allowance of the claims and do not limit the equivalence of the claims.

Regarding the rejections of the claims, applicant respectfully traverses the assertions in the previous office actions.

In response to the rejection of claims 9-12, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1st ¶, for allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification, the claims are part of the specification and the specification supports the claims. More specifically:

With regard to claims 9-11, it is well known that the bias current of a laser diode commonly used for optical links in CATV systems is an RF DC current. The current is DC because it only flows in one direction, and the current is RF because the DC current is modulated by a RF signal. Those skilled in the art commonly refer to RF signals in which the current is always in the same direction as a DC signal. The RF DC signal inherently has an RF range of RF level which is also a DC range of DC level.

With regard to claim 12, the paragraph starting at page 9, line 3 of the description suggests:

"Third transmitter feedback loop 455 provides a feedback signal from the back facet monitor 143 to the RF<sub>IN</sub> attenuator 120. Third transmitter feedback loop 455 includes a filter oscillator circuit, an RF detector circuit, and a feedback attenuator circuit. The RF in the transmitted signal is sensed by the RF detector circuit of feedback circuit 430 and is then fed to the feedback attenuator circuit which reduces or increases attenuation as needed."

which is consistent with claim 12.

With regard to claims 15 and 16 the rejection is moot in view of the correction of an obvious error. Those skilled in the art would have recognized the error and understood the prior claims to mean the same thing as the above-amended claims.

In response to the rejection of claims 7 and 21-32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd ¶, for allegedly being indefinite, this rejection is moot in view of the above amendments. The rejection is without merit because those skilled in the art in view of the specification would have recognized the obvious errors and understood the claims to have meant the same as the above-amended claims.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-6, 8, 13-14, 17-20 and 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), for allegedly being unpatentable over US6687466 to Chiappetta in view of US5267071 to Little, the differences between the claims and the combination of citation are such that the subject matter as a whole would not have been obvious at the time the invention was made, to those of ordinary skill in the art. More specifically:

With regard to claims 1, 17 and 33 the combination of the citations does not suggest "the laser including a back facet monitor circuit providing a back facet feedback signal depending on the optical signal" as in claims 1, 17 and 33. Also the combination of citations does not suggest, "the transmitter feedback loops include an RF level derived from a back facet feedback signal" as in claims 1, 17, 33. Furthermore, claims 2-6, 8, 14, 17-20 and 34 are all dependent on one of claim 1, 17 and 33 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 17 and 33.

The examiner has not pointed out any motivation or suggestion in any prior art indicating that at the time of the invention it was obvious to combine the citations.

With regard to new claims 35-42, the new claims are distinguished from the citations. The citations do not suggest, "a back facet circuit providing an back facet feedback signal from the back facet depending on the RF modulated optical signal" as in claims 35 and 41. Also the citations do not suggest "a bias circuit to control the laser bias depending on the back facet feedback signal" as in claims 35 and 41. Also the citations do not suggest "a first feedback attenuation circuit to control the attenuation circuit depending on the back facet feedback signal" as in claims 35 and 41. Claims 36-39 are dependent on claim 35 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons.

The citations do not suggest "an optical modulation voltage circuit to control the optical modulation voltage and provide a first attenuation feedback signal depending on the optical modulation voltage" as in claims 38 and 42. There is no indication in Figure 4 or col. 8 lines 39-60 that there is any control of the modulation voltage of the photo diode in Little.

Also, The citations do not suggest "a feedback attenuation circuit to control the attenuation of the attenuation circuit depending on the first attenuation feedback signal depending on the optical modulation voltage" as in claims 38 and 42. Claims 39-40 are dependent on claim 38 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons.

The claims are definite and distinguished from the citations and Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of all claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any fee (except the issue fee) including fees for any required extension of time, to Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael E. Belk  
Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357  
Senior Patent Counsel  
(914) 333-9643